DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 732 EC 300 467

AUTHOR Hunsaker, Scott L.; And Others
TITLE Instrument Use in the Identification of Gifted and Talented Children.
INSTITUTION National Research Center on the Gifted Talented, Charlottesville, VA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 20 Jun 91
NOTE 63p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Program Grant Recipients (Washington, DC, June 20, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability Identification; Achievement Tests; Aptitude Tests; Creativity; Definitions; Educational Diagnosis; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Evaluation Methods; *Gifted; Gifted Disabled; Gifted Disadvantaged; Intelligence Tests; Limited English Speaking; National Surveys; Racial Factors; Student Evaluation; *Talent; *Talent Identification; Tests

ABSTRACT

Information was solicited through mass mailings to school districts concerning their definitions of gifted and talented, the instruments they use to identify gifted and talented students, and the underserved populations they seek to serve. This report is based on information from 542 files, representing approximately 10% of the mass mailing. Results indicate the following: (1) the U.S. Office of Education definition of gifted is used by 73% of school districts, followed by use of an intelligence quotient definition by 15% and the Three-Ring definition by 11%; (2) there is still an over-reliance on the general intellectual aptitude construct; (3) a high number of districts measure general intellectual aptitude by means of academic achievement tests; and (4) in the measurement of creativity, there is a prevalence of an ideation construct and the use of intelligence and achievement tests. The paper concludes that the gap between what is considered appropriate practice for gifted identification and actual practice is still extensive. Some attention is being paid to the needs of a general racial/ethnic category, but little is being done with regard to specific populations--few districts consider the needs of limited English speakers, low socioeconomic status students, or students with handicapping conditions. The paper includes 4 references and 15 tables. Appendices provide a data coding guide and recording form. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334732

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Instrument Use in the Identification of Gifted and Talented Children

by

Scott L. Hunsaker, Laurie Bassin Abeel, & Carolyn M. Callahan

National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented

University of Virginia

June 20, 1991

Paper presented at the Meeting of the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Program Grant Recipients, Washington, DC.

The National Research Center on the Gifted Talented is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Deparmentment of Education.

RUNNING HEAD: Instrument Use in Gifted Identification

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 300467

Instrument Use in the Identification of Gifted and Talented Children

In the past decade a number of studies have been conducted enumerating practices in identifing gifted and talented students. These include the National Identification Study (Alvino, McDonnel, & Richert, 1981), the Richardson Study (Cox, Daniel, and Boston, 1985), and the State of the State Reports (Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, 1987; in press). These surveys have shown a gap between the theory on gifted identification and its practice. However, the studies were limited by the level of detail in reporting instruments, definitions, constructs, services to underserved populations, and/or the relationships between these. The focus has been on the USOE definition categories, general special population designations, and general instrument types (with the National Identification Study being an exception to the latter focus). As a result, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (NRC G/T) surveyed school districts with respect to their own definitions of gifted and talented, the specific instruments they use, and the specific underserved populations they seek to serve.

Methodology

Data-Gathering

The methodology of data-gathering for this survey of gifted identification

practices has been described in detail elsewhere (Callahan & Hunsaker, 1991). In summary, information was solicited through mass mailings to school districts, contacts in state departments, and appeals through professional journals and conferences. The present report is based on information from 542 files. This represents approximately 10% of the mass mailing.[1]

Data Analysis

A coding guide for recording individual school definitions, types of instruments used, respondents, etc. was developed by NRC G/T staff, reviewed by an Advisory Board, and revised. In addition, as school district information was recorded using the guide, new categories and codes were created. The current coding guide is provided in Appendix A.

The information from each school district was categorized by NRC G/T staff using using the special form shown in Appendix B. Periodic spot checks of the coding were made by other staff members.

After all information for each file was coded, freqency counts were conducted focusing on definition, constructs, published instruments, and underserved populations. These were done on matrices so the inter-relationships among foci would be apparent.

---

[1]At least 65 school districts reponded that they would like to have forwarded materials but could not do so because the program and recently been cut or was undergoing extensive change. New files continue to come in daily. These will be included in future analyses.

Limitations

The information reported should be interpreted cautiously. Sampling was not random. While the data cannot be statistically generalized to the entire country, they are indicative of trends that deserve attention. Further, what is reported here is the use of published instruments for identifying giftedness. Information on non-published, locally produced instruments was gathered, but will be reported at a later date.

Results

Definitions

Table 1 shows which definitions of gifted and talented are used most widely in school districts across the country. Far and away, the most frequently adopted definition is the United States Office of Education (USOE) definition, used in 260 (73%) of reporting school districts. A strict IQ definition is used in 54 districts (15%), and the Three-Ring definition is used in 41 districts (11%). Interestingly, 8 school districts have adopted both the USOE and the Three-Ring definitions (this, despite the fact that the Three-Ring had its genesis partly in a critique of the USOE definition). Four districts had no definition.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Defintions, Constructs and Instruments

USOE Definition. When we examine the constructs considered in each definition, along with the instruments used to measure them, some interesting patterns emerge. As shown in Table 2, the most frequently adopted construct of the USOE definition is general intellectual aptitude, which is most frequently measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R), Otis-Lennon School Abilities Test (OLSAT), Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT), Scales for Rating the Behavior Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS)[2], Stanford-Binet, and Slosson. Academic constructs have the next highest acceptance rate and are measured most frequently by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), SRBCSS, SRA Achievement Test (SRA), and California Achievement Test (CAT). Creativity was also adopted by numerous school districts. It is measured primarily by the SRBCSS, with a number of districts using the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking-Figural (TTCT-F) and Structure of the Intellect (SOI) tests. The visual and performing arts construct is measured primarily by the SRBCSS, followed by SOI tests and the Kranz Talent Identification Instrument. Finally, leadership is measured primarily by SRBCSS.

[2]Any reference to the SRBCSS refers to the scales as published by Creative Learning Press and not to the many adaptations devised by numerous schoo districts.

Insert Table 2 about here.

A number of interesting and troubling trends are shown on this table. First of all, we note the emergence of individual IQ tests as a frequently cited measurement general intellectual aptitude. While this may seem encouraging, it still exhibits the over-reliance on the general intellectual aptitude construct within gifted programs. Further, the WISC-R (the most prevalently used individual IQ test) is used as the initial test (usually following a teacher or parent referral) in only 30% of the districts reporting its use. In the other 70% of the districts use of WISC-R follows screening on a group intelligence or achievement test or is used only in difficult cases. Analysis of the specific use of other individual intelligence tests will be conducted later.

We also note the apparent confusion between the general intellectual and specific academic aptitude categories. A high number of districts measure general intellectual aptitude with academic achievement tests. Note also, the few responses under specific intellectual aptitude (a construct that more accurately reflects our current understanding of intelligence than the general intellectual sobriquet posited by the USOE). Further, some IQ tests that were developed specifically to measure specific intellectual aptitude (such as CogAT)

are being used to measure the general construct.

Table 2 also shows that published instruments are used to meausre general, rather than specific, academic achievement, even when the test provides specific academic sub-scales. Note, for example, that on the ITBS, 39 districts use it to measure general academic achievement, while less than half that number use it to measure mathematical, language, science, or social science achievement. A similar pattern is noted on the other leading achievement tests, with the exception of the California Achievement Test.

In the measurement of creativity, we note the prevalence of a ideation construct and the disturbing use of IQ and achievement tests. This occurs also in the arts, in leadership, and in psychomotor ability (a construct some are still identifying even though it has been removed from the USOE definition). Finally, we point out the high number who use the SRBCSS to measure task commitment even though it is not part of the USOE definition. This can be partially explained, however, by the presence of eight school districts that have adopted both the USOE and the Three-Ring definitions.

Finally, districts usually do not adopt the USOE definition in its entirety. Instead, they chose specific constructs (usually some combination of general intellectual aptitude, specific academic aptitude, creativity, and sometimes leadership and visual and performing arts). Further, though the USOE

definition suggest assessing the various components singly or in combination, districts tend to measure them in combination--requiring students to be gifted across the board.

IQ. Under the IQ definition, as shown in Table 3, the most frequently adopted construct is general intellectual ability, measured primarily by the WISC-R, Stanford-Binet, OLSAT, ITBS, SRBCSS, CogAT, CAT, and Slosson. Again, the confusion between general and specific intellect and intellect and academics is apparent in instruments used in gifted assessment under the IQ definition. One possible explanation is that even though these districts have not adopted a broader definition of giftedness, they are attempting to employ multiple criteria to assess it.

Insert Table 3 about here.

Three-Ring. For the Three-Ring definition, as shown in Table 4, measurement of above-average ability is done mainly by measuring IQ with the CogAT, WISC-R, OLSAT, and Slossen. Another frequently used instrument is the SRBCSS. Another above-average ability construct used by the school districts is general academic ability, measured primarily with ITBS and SRBCSS. Only a few districts measure above-average ability in a specific

academic area. Creativity is again dominated by the ideation construct and is measured mainly with the SRBCSS. Finally, we note the exclusive use of SRBCSS to measure task-commitment.

Insert Table 4 about here.

Underserved Populations

Racial/Ethnic Populations

Interesting patterns emerge in the identification of underserved gifted and talented populations. First of all, we had to create a code for general racial/ethnic populations since most districts did not provide information concerning any specific populations they were trying to serve. Under the USOE definition (see Table 5), most instruments used to identify racial or ethnic groups are used to assess general intellectual aptitude, and the instrument of choice is the WISC-R. Other IQ tests were also mentioned frequently. Assessment of specific academic ability, creativity, arts ability, and leadership is not as extensive. For specific academic ability the instrument of choice is the ITBS, with SRBCSS following. The SRBCSS is also the major assessment device for creativity. For the Three-Ring constructs and IQ few special testing provisions are made for general racial/ethnic category students.

Insert Table 5 about here.

For specific racial/ethnic groups, we found few special provisions in place with regard to published instruments--other than the lack of their use. However, WISC-R was mentioned by a greater number of those making specific provisions for Hispanic students.

Insert Table 6 about here.

Insert Table 7 about here.

Insert Table 8 about here.

Insert Table 9 about here.

Limited English Speaking

As shown in Table 10, students with limited English speaking ability are evaluated mostly under the USOE construct of general intellectual ability, measured for the most part by the WISC-R. The Stanford-Binet is also frequently used. Anecdotally, many of the tests listed here are used in translation. Few special provisions have been made by districts under the IQ or Three-Ring definitions.

Insert Table 10 about here.

Low Socio-Economic Status

As can be seen in Table 11, the major measurement of low SES students is in the area of general intellectual aptitude, measured mostly by the WISC-R. Other IQ tests are also used frequently in this area. Again, few provisions are made by districts using the IQ and Three-Ring definitions.

Insert Table 11 about here.

Handicapping Conditions

Tables 12 through 15 show the measurements used for identifying students with handicapping conditions. Most of the districts that described any

special considerations for students with handicapping conditions did so in a general way. The major constructs measured were general intellectual aptitude and specific academic ability under the USOE definition. IQ tests are the primary instruments for assessing general intellectual ability. The ITBS and SRBCSS are the primary instruments for assessing specific academic aptitude. It had been our intention to identify instruments used with specific handicapping conditions such as visual and hearing impairment, however, responding districts sent information about specifics only for the physically challenged, the learning disabled, and underachievers. Even within these categories little is being done with published instruments to assess giftedness.

Summary

The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented solicited and received identification information and instruments from well over 500 school districts. These materials were reviewed and categorized according to gifted definitions, constructs, and special populations. The most commonly used definition of giftedness is the USOE definition, with the IQ definition and the Three-Ring definition also receiving wide-spread use.

However, we found that the gap between what is considered appropriate practice for gifted identification and actual practice is still extensive. Instruments continue to be used incorrectly--measuring constructs for which

they have not been validated. Confusion between défintions and constructs remains. Some attention is being paid to the needs of a general racial/ethnic category, but little is being done with regard to specific populations. Further, few districts consider the needs of limited English speakers, low SES students, or students with handicapping conditions.

It has been well over a decade since similar charges against the practice of identifying gifted students have been made. School districts appear to be using multi-faceted definitions, measured with multiple criteria. Further, individual IQ tests seem to be used to a greater extent. However, the appropriateness of using specific published instruments is not being assessed by the school districts. Apparently, the literature outlining appropriate and promising identification practices is not getting into the hands of school-level decision makers in a way that will effect change in the processes used. Greater effort must be made by the research community to translate the work on identification into workable systems that can be adopted by local school systems.

REFERENCES

Alvino, J., McDonnel, R. C., & Richert, S. (1981). National survey of identification practices in gifted and talented education. Exceptional Children, 48, 124-132.

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. (1987). The 1987 state of the states gifted and talented education report. Topeka, KS: Author.

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. (In press). The 1990 state of the states gifted and talented education report. Augusta, ME: Author.

Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B. O. (1985). Educating able learners: Programs and promising practices. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

TABLES

Table 1

Fregencies of Gifted Definitions Adopted

Defintion	Frequency
USOE	260[a]
IQ	54
Three-Ring	41[a]
Multiple Intelligence	1
Structure of Intellect	1
Other	8
No Definition	4

[a]Eight of these districts use Three-Ring and USOE.

Note: N reporting = 542. Information not available on 185.

Table 2

Published Instruments As Used With USOE Constructs

	Constructs															
Instrument	GI	GA	MQ	VL	SC	SS	CI	CP	MU	AC	DA	PD	IP	PM	TC	SI
WISC-R	50	2	1	2	1	1	3	2								
OLSAT	46	2	1	1	1	1			1			1	1	1		
Cognitive Abilities Test	38	3	5	5	2	1	2	1	2	1			1	2		
Slossen	23		1	2	1		2	1								
Stanford Binet	25		1				1	1								
SRBCSS	26	23	4	6	3	3	29	2	6	5	2	4	16		18	1
Test of Cognitive Skills	14	1	1	1	1		2	1	1	1		1				
ITBS	13	39	17	15	6	5	1									1
California Achievement	13	13	10	10	1	1	1		1			1		1	1	
OLMAT	11	2					1									
Structure of Intellect	10	1	2	1			8	2	4	4		5	3	1		
SRA	6	17	7	7	3	2		1								
Stanford Achievement	5	12	6	6	2	2	1						1			
Metropolitan Achievement	10	3	3	3	2											
Calif. Test/Basic Skills	3	9	3	3	1	2										
GIFT	1						7		1	1		1				1
GIFFI	1						6		1	1		1				1
TTCT-Figural	2						12					2				
Kranz Talent ID	3	2	1		1		3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2		

Table 3

Published Instruments as Used With IQ Constructs

	Constructs								
Instrument	GI	GA	MQ	VL	SC	SS	CI	CP	VE
WISC-R	19	1							
Stanford-Binet	13	1							
OLSAT	13								
ITBS	13	1	1	1					
SRBCSS	12	2		1			2	1	
Cognitive Abilities Test	11		1	1					
California Achievement	11	3							
Slossen	10								
Test of Cognitive Skills	8		1	1	1	1			
K-ABC	7	2							
Stanford Achievement	5	3							
SRA	5								1
PIAT	1	3							
Woodcock-Johnson	5								
Structure of Intellect	4						1	1	
TTCT - Figural							1	1	
Key Math			2						
Woodcock Reading Mastery				2					

Table 4

Published Instruments as Used With Three Ring Constructs

	Constructs									
Instrument	GI	GA	VL	MQ	SC	SS	CI	CP	TC	IP
Cognitive Abilities Test	12	3	1	2			1			
WISC-R	11									
SRBCSS	9	8	1				10		9	2
OLSAT	8									
Slossen	8									
ITBS	6	10	1	1	1	1	1			
Metropolitan Achievement	4	3		1	1					
Stanford Achievement	1	6	2							
California Achievement	2	4	2	2						
Structure of Intellect	2						3			
GIFT							3			
TTCT-Figural							4			
WISC	3						1	1		

Table 5

Underserved Populations: General Racial/Ethnic (RE)

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	General Intellect.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS	3	7					1				2
CogAT	7	2					1				2
OLSAT	7	1					1				1
SRA	2	1									1
SRBCSS	4	5	4		2	3	1	1	1	1	3
Slossen	7	1					2				
Stanford Achievement	2	3									1
Stanford-Binet	9		1	1			1				
SOI	2	2	2			1					
Test of Cog. Skills	4				1			1			1
WISC-R	15	2	1	1			2				3
California Achieve.	1	4						1			1
K-ABC	3		1	1			1				
Kranz Talent ID	1	1	1	1	1	1					
Leiter IPS	3										1

Table 5 (continued)

Underserved Populations: General Racial/Ethnic (RE)

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	General Intellect.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
PPVT	4										
Raven Progressive	3										1
Gifted Eval. Scale	1	1	1		1	1					
WISC	3										
PIAT	1	1						1			
Comprehensive TBS		5									
Woodcock-Johnson		3					1				

Table 6

Underserved Populations: African-American/Black

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS	1	3									1
Cognitive Abilities	1										1
OLSAT	2										
Slossen											1
Stanford Achievement											1
Stanford-Binet											1
Test of Cog. Skills											1
WISC-R	2										1
K-ABC											1
SAGES	1										
Tests of Creative Pot.			1								
TTCT - Figural			1								
TTCT - Verbal			1								
SRBCSS						1					
PPVT											1

Table 7

Underserved Populations: Hispanic-American

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS	1	2									1
Cognitive Abilities											
OLSAT	4										
SRA											1
SRBCSS						1					1
Slossen	1										
Stanford Achievement	1	1									2
Stanford-Binet	3										3
Structure of Intellect			1								
Test of Cog. Skills	2										1
WISC-R	6										3
K-ABC	1										3
PPVT	1										1
Raven Coloured Prog.	1										1
TTCT - Verbal			1								

Table 7 (continued)

Underserved Populations: Hispanic-American

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
TTCT - Figural											
Calif. Ach.Test	2	3									
Leiter IPS	2										1
Raven Prog. Mat.											1

Table 8

Underserved Populations: Native American

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS		1									
Cognitive Abilities	1										
ACER & Univ of Melbourne Music Eval					1						
SRA		1									
Drake Music Apt.Test					1						
Gordon Musical Apt.					1						
Stanford Ach. Test		1									
Iowa Test Music Apt.					1						
Structure of Intellect											1
Test of Cog. Skills											1
WISC-R	1										2
K-ABC											1
Seashore					1						
Raven Standard Prog.											1
Barron-Welsh Art Scale					1						

Table 8 (continued)

Underserved Populations: Native American

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
TTCT - Figural	1										
California Achievement											
Henmon-Nelson Intell.	1										
Lorge-Thorndike	1										
SFTAA	1										
Columbia Ment.Mat.Scal											1
Leiter IPS											1
WAIS-R											1
Horn Art Inventory					1						
Meier Art Tests					1						

Table 9

Underserved Populations: Asian-American

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
Test of Cog. Skills	1										1
WISC-R	1										1
K-ABC											1

Table 10

Underserved Populations: Limited English Speaking

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS	1	4									3
Cognitive Abilities	4	1					1				
OLSAT	6										1
SRA	1	1									1
SRBCSS	3	3	2		1	2					2
Slossen	6	1					1				1
Stanford Achievement	1	2									
Stanford-Binet	9		1	1			1				1
Structure of Intellect	1		1		1	1					1
Test of Cog. Skills	1										
WISC-R	15	1		1			1				4
California Achieve.	2	4									1
K-ABC	4			1			1				1
Leiter IPS	3										1
PPVT	3										

Table 10 (continued)

Underserved Populations: Limited English Speaking

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
Raven Prog. Matrices	2										1
Raven Coloured Prog.	2										1
WISC	2										
GIFT		1	2								
GIFFI			2								
Comprehensive TBS											2

Table 11

Underserved Populations: Low Socio-Economic Status

	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
Instrument	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS	1	7					1				3
CogAT	6	2									1
OLSAT	7	1									2
SRA	1	1									1
SRBCSS	2	3	2			2					2
Slossen	6	1					2				
Stanford Achievement		1									1
Stanford-Binet	7		1	1							
SOI	1										
Test of Cog. Skills	1										
WISC-R	13	1	1	1							2
California Achieve.	1	3									2
K-ABC	3		1	1			1				
Leiter IPS	1										
PPVT	4										

Table 11 (continued)

Underserved Populations: Low Socio-Economic Status

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
Raven Prog. Matrices	2										
WISC	2										
Gifted Eval. Scale	1	1	1		1	1					
TTCT - Figural			2	1							
Comprehensive TBS	1										2

Table 12

Underserved Populations: General Handicapped

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS	1	5					1				1
CogAT	5	2									1
OLSAT	4	1									2
SRA	3	1									
SRBCSS	2	4	3		1	1	2				1
Slossen	2										
Stanford Achievement	1	2									1
Stanford-Binet	1										
Structure of Intellect			1								
Test of Cog. Skills	2										
WISC-R	7	2									1
K-ABC	1						1				
PPVT	2										
Raven Prog. Matrices	1		1								
WISC	2										

Table 12 (continued)

Underserved Populations: General Handicapped

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	AAA GI	AAA GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
Calif. Ach.Test	1										1

Table 13

Underserved Populations: Physically Challenged

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	Abils GI	Abils GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
Christenson Guilford Fluency Test											1
Columbia Ment. Mat.											1
Comprehensive TBS											1
SRA											1
Slossen	1										
Stanford Achievement	1										1
Stanford-Binet	2										2
WISC-R	2										1
K-ABC											2
Pictorial Test Intell.											1
Purdue Elem.Prob.Solv.											1
Ross Test Higher Cog.											1
Stanford Early Sch.Ach											1
Leiter IPS	1										1
Spanish Assess Bas.Ed.	1										

Table 13 (continued)

Underserved Populations: Physically Challenged

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	Abils GI	Abils GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
Cornell Crit. Think.											1
Hiskey-Nebraska Test											1

Table 14

Underserved Populations: Learning Disabled

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	Abils GI	Abils GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS		1									2
CogAT	1										4
OLSAT	3										1
SRA	2	1									1
SRBCSS	2	3	3		1	2					
Slossen											1
Stanford Achievement		1									
Stanford-Binet	1										2
Structure of Intellect	1		1								
Test of Cog. Skills											2
WISC-R	4										3
K-ABC	1										
California Achievement		1									1

Table 15

Underserved Populations: Underachievers

Instrument	USOE						THREE RING				IQ
	Genl Intell.	Spec. Acad.	Creativity CI	Creativity CP	Arts	Lead.	Abils GI	Abils GA	Creativity	Task Comm.	Genl. Intell.
ITBS		2									
CogAT	3										
OLSAT	2						1				2
SRA		1									1
SRBCSS	1	1	2			2	1	1	1	1	1
Slossen	4	1					1				2
Stanford Achievement	1	2									1
Stanford-Binet	5		1	1							2
Structure of Intellect											
Test of Cog. Skills	1							1			1
WISC-R	5		1	1							1
K-ABC	1	1	1	1	1		1				1
TTCT - Figural			2	1	1						
Kranz Talent ID	1	1	1	1	1	1					1
California Achieve.		2						1			1

APPENDICES

IDENTIFICATION INSTRUMENT FILE REVIEW CODES

Category	Response	Code
File Number	File Number	
Confidentiality	Confidentiality	CN
Instrument Title	Instrument Title	
Instrument Source	Instrument Source	
Instrument Type	Standardized Objective Aptitude/ Ability/Intelligence Test	SI
	Standardized Objective Achievement Test	SA
	Rating Scale	RS
	Checklist	CL
	Open-ended Protocol	OE
	Standardized Creativity Test	CT
	Standardized Thinking Test	TT
	Other	OT
	Not Available/Applicable	NA
Instrument Respondent	Student	ST
	Parent	PA
	Teacher	TE
	Guidance Counselor	GC
	School Psychologist	SP
	Practicing Professional	PP
	Community Leader	CL
	Other	OT
	Not Available/Applicable	NA
Response Strategy	Test, Individual	TI

Category	Response	Code
Response Strategy (continued)	Test, Group	TG
	Questionnaire	QU
	Observation	OB
	Interview	IV
	Audition	AU
	Product/Portfolio	PR
	Biography	BI
	Other	OT
	Not Available/Applicable	NA
Gifted Definition	General IQ	IQ
	USOE	US
	Three-Ring	TR
	Information-Processing	IP
	Multiple Intelligences	MI
	Tannenbaum	TA
	Multiple Talent	MT
	Structure of the Intellect	SI
	Other	OT
	Not Available/Applicable	NA
Gifted Construct	General Intellectual Ability	GI
	Specific Intellectual Abilities	SI
	General Academic Ability	GA
	Verbal/Linguistic Ability	VL
	Mathematical/Logical Ability	MQ
	Scientific Aptitude	SC

Category	Response	Code
Gifted Construct (continued)	Social Science Aptitude	SS
	Painting/Drawing Ability	PD
	Sculpting Ability	SL
	Photography Ability	PH
	Other Visual Arts Ability	VA
	Music Performance Ability--Voice	MV
	Music Performance Ability--Instrumental	MI
	Music Composition Ability	MC
	Dance Ability	DA
	Acting Ability	AC
	Other Performing Arts Ability	PA
	Vocational Education/Practical Arts Ability	VE
	Inter/Intra-personal Ability/ Leadership/Psycho-Social Ability	IP
	Creativity: Ideation	CI
	Creativity: Problem-Solving	CP
	Task-Commitment/Motivation	TC
	Psycho-motor/Bodily-Kinesthetic Ability	PM
School Level	Pre-School (P-K)	PR
	Elementary (K-6)	EL
	Middle School/Junior High (6-9)	MI
	High School (9-12)	HS

The following codes are to be used in the Underserved Populations section of the form:

Category	Response	Code
Ethnic/Minority Considerations	African-American/Black	AF
	Hispanic-American	HI
	Asian-American	AS
	Native American	NA
	Polynesian	PL
	Racial/Ethnic Minorities--General	RE
	Other Ethnic/Minority Groups	OT
Language Considerations	Limited English Speaking	LE
Population Considerations	Urban	UR
	Sub-urban	SU
	Rural	RU
Socio-Economic Considerations	Low SES	LO
Gender Considerations	Female	FE
	Male	MA
Handicapped Considerations	Learning Disabled	LD
	Hearing Impaired	HI
	Visually Impaired	VI
	Physically Challenged	PC
	General Handicapped	HG
Achievement	Underachievement	UN

The above constitutes the end of the Underserved Populations section.

Category	Response	Code
Reliability Information	Stability/Test-Retest	ST
	Internal Consistency/ Split Half/ Alpha Coefficient/Kuder-Richardson	IC
	Equivalence/Alternate Forms	EQ
	Inter-rater	IR
Validity Information	Face	FA
	Content	CO
	Criterion: Concurrent	CC
	Criterion: Predictive	CP
	Construct	CS

IDENTIFICATION INSTRUMENT DATA-BASE FORM

FILE NUMBER:	INSTRUMENT TITLE:	
INSTRUMENT SOURCE:		
INSTRUMENT TYPE:	INSTRUMENT RESPONDENT:	RESPONSE STRATEGY:
GIFTED DEFINITION:	GIFTED CONSTRUCT:	SCHOOL LEVEL:
UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS:	RELIABILITY DATA:	VALIDITY DATA:
COMMENTS:		